

Claims 7 and 12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 18-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,294,800 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,847,507.

These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants submit a terminal disclaimer to overcome the double patenting rejection. Applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the double patenting rejections.


Non-elected claims method 32-35 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 32 has been previously amended to include all limitations of claim 1.<sup>1</sup> Applicants respectfully request that claims 32-35 be rejoined with claims 1-31 and 36-42 because claim 32 has the same or narrower scope than claim 1.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/17/03  
FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428

By Leo Radomsky  
Leon Radomsky  
Registration No. 43,445

  
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

<sup>1</sup> Claim 1 generically recites a radiation source, while claim 32 recites a light emitting diode, which is a specie of radiation source genus. Thus, claim 32 is actually narrower than claim 1 in this respect.